

REMARKS

Claims 10-29 are pending in this application. Independent Claims 10 and 23 have been amended to clarify the present invention reciting that a user is able to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to the viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program. Upon completion of the program blocking of viewing is monitored according to the viewer profile upon completion of said selected program. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification and specifically on Page 5, lines 8-9; Page 6, lines 1-7; and Page 7, lines 1-27. Claims 14-18, 22 and 24026 have been amended to conform with the amendments to claims 10 and 23 thereby providing antecedent basis for all terms.

Rejection of Claims 10-17, 19, and 21-29 under 35 § 102(b)

Claims 10-17, 19 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Collings.

The present claimed invention recites a method and system for selectively blocking viewing of television programs. A video signal processor produces an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce a plurality of images for display to at least one viewer. A supervisor control system is provided which is operable by a supervisor to create at least one viewer profile identifying images to be blocked from display to the at least one viewer. The supervisor control system allows for selection of a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile, thereby unblocking the select program. Upon completion of the select program, the supervisor control system continues to control viewing according to the at least one viewer profile.

Collings neither discloses nor suggests allowing a user “to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said

viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked, whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile” as in the present claimed invention. Collins is directed to selectively blocking audio and video signals based upon a comparison of the contents of data packets transmitted with a television signal to stored preferences. The user may temporarily disable certain or all blocking features for a period of time. This is unlike the present claimed invention which allows selection of a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile to be viewed by a user. After completion of the program, identification of images to be blocked according to the set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile. Collings is directed to disabling one or more blocking features. However, Collings neither discloses nor suggests overriding all blocking features for a specific program and returning to controlling viewing according to the set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile after completion of the program as in the present claimed invention.

As Collings neither discloses nor suggests “select[ing] a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked, whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system continues to control viewing according to the at least one viewer profile” as in the present claimed invention, the present claimed invention is not anticipated by Collings. In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Collings showing the above discussed features. As claims 11-17, 19 and 21-29 are dependent on claims 10 and 23, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also not anticipated by Collings. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 18 and 20 under 35 § 103(a)

Claim 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collings in view of West.

West was cited to show multiple profiles for different users as well as overrides for each profile. However, similarly to Collings, West neither discloses nor suggests “select[ing] a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked, whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile” as in the present claimed invention. West does disclose entering exclusion codes for programs or groups of programs. However, West neither discloses nor suggests selection of a specific program as claimed in independent claim 10.

As neither West nor Collings when taken alone or in combination disclose “select[ing] a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked, whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system continues to control viewing according to the at least one viewer profile” as claimed in claim 10 of the present claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that the present claimed invention is patentable over the combination of Collings and West. In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Collings showing the above discussed features. As claims 18 and 20 are dependent on claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also patentable over Collings when taken alone or in combination with West. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for

Application No. 09/475,448

Attorney Docket No. RCA89385

allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No additional fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
David Johnston Lynch

By:


Jackie Jay Schwartz

Registration No. 34,721

Telephone No.: (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
October 22, 2004